

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02430 011226Z

45

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /026 W

----- 121521

P R 011120Z MAY 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1550

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

S E C R E T USNATO 2430

EXDIS

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: PROCEEDING IN NATO WITH OPTION III

DEPARTMENT PLEASE PASS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, USNMR SHAPE  
AND USCINCEUR

REF: A. USNATO 2315

B. STATE 91705

1. ON APRIL 30, AT UK REQUEST, UK, FRG AND US MISSION OFFICERS  
MET ON HOW TO HANDLE OPTION III IN NATO, AS FOLLOW-UP TO MEETING  
REPORTED REF A.

2. UK DELEGATION OFFICERS (LOGAN AND BAILES) TOOK STRONG LINE  
THAT OPTION III REQUIRES THOROUGH MILITARY TECHNICAL STUDY WITHIN  
THE ALLIANCE. THE UK WISHES IMPORTANT ROLE FOR BOTH MC AND MBFR  
WORKING GROUP. SPC MEETINGS WITH EXPERTS ARE ALL RIGHT AS LONG  
AS MBFR WORKING GROUP IS ABLE TO PERFORM ITS NORMAL ROLE. UK  
AUTHORITIES THOUGHT SPC WITH EXPERTS COULD NOT MEET FREQUENTLY  
ENOUGH FOR THOROUGH MILITARY-TECHNICAL STUDY. UK WOULD BE WILLING  
TO HAVE WG MEET TWICE A WEEK IF NECESSARY, AND FOR SPC TO GIVE  
WG STRICT DEADLINES. UK CONSIDERED THAT ALLIANCE WORK WOULD  
PROCEED MORE EXPEDITIOUSLY WITH SUBSTANTIAL WG INVOLVEMENT FROM  
THE BEGINNING. HOWEVER, ADEQUATE MILITARY-TECHNICAL ANALYSIS  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02430 011226Z

WOULD TAKE TIME.

3. FRG DELEGATION OFFICERS (BOSS AND HOYNCK) SAID BONN GENERALLY  
AGREES WITH US ON HOW TO HANDLE OPTION III. BONN WISHES EMPHASIS

ON POLICY ASPECTS THROUGH SPC REINFORCED BY EXPERTS. BONN ALSO DOES NOT EXCLUDE THAT SPC MIGHT EVENTUALLY FIND IT USEFUL TO ASSIGN WG SPECIFIC, LIMITED TASKS WITH STRICT DEADLINES. HOWEVER, FRG DID NOT SEE MORE THAN MINIMUM ROLE FOR WG. LOGAN DISAGREED; HE SAID UK WANTS MAXIMUM ROLE FOR WG, AND WOULD EXPECT SPC TO REFER MILITARY-TECHNICAL MATTERS TO WG FREQUENTLY.

4. US MISSION OFFICERS (PEREZ AND MOORE) STRESSED THAT US WISHES FULL CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUES, BUT ALSO WANTS EXPEDITIOUS CONSIDERATION, PER AGREEMENT AT THE WASHINGTON TRILATERALS (PARA 4, REF B). THIS IS WHY US IS PREPARED TO BRING ITS EXPERTS ACROSS ATLANTIC TO REINFORCE SPC MEETINGS. DIRECT CONTACT BETWEEN EXPERTS FROM CAPITALS WOULD FACILITATE THE FULL AND EXPEDITIOUS CONSIDERATION WE WANT. THIS WOULD MAKE SUBSTANTIVE DISCUSSIONS IN OTHER FORUMS UNNECESSARY AND DUPLICATIVE. US SEES THIS AS A SPECIAL PROCEDURE FOR A SPECIAL SUBJECT. RE FRG REMARK THAT BONN DOES NOT EXCLUDE EVENTUAL ASSIGNMENT OF SPECIFIC LIMITED TASKS TO WG, MISSION OFFICERS SAID THAT ALLIES WOULD OF COURSE CONSIDER THIS IF THE NEED AROSE, BUT EXPRESSED SKEPTICISM THAT IT WOULD.

5. UK ALSO BELIEVES SOME OF THE ALLIED DISCUSSIONS ON OPTION III MAY REQUIRE EXCLUSION OF PORTUGAL, PARTICULARLY ANY DISCUSSION OF COSMIC-TOP SECRET MATERIAL. MISSION OFFICERS REITERATED POINTS IN PARA 5, REF B.

6. FRG AND UK DELEGATION OFFICERS AGAIN EXPRESSED HOPE US WOULD INTRODUCE OPTION III PRIOR TO DPC MINISTERIAL MAY 22-23 (PARA 3, REF A). FRG OFFICERS THOUGHT INTRODUCTION AT ANY TIME WOULD BE ALL RIGHT WITH BONN BUT UK OFFICERS HOPED US COULD HOLD OFF UNTIL RECEIPT OF LATEST UK COMMENTS.

7. FRG DELEGATION OFFICERS SAID THAT IN VIEW OF THE DISAGREEMENT ON HOW TO PROCEED ON MILITARY-TECHNICAL QUESTIONS, US MIGHT PROPOSE MODALITIES WHEN IT INTRODUCES OPTION III, AND THE ISSUE WOULD THEN BE DISCUSSED IN ALLIANCE AS A WHOLE.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02430 011226Z

8. COMMENT: UK ATTITUDE INDICATES THAT UK IS PREPARED FOR LENGTHY ALLIANCE DISCUSSIONS OF OPTION III. MISSION AGREES ALLIANCE CONSULTATIONS SHOULD BE BOTH EXPEDITIOUS AND FULL, AS PER PARA 4, REF B. UK CLEARLY IS NOT SEEKING A BALANCE BETWEEN THESE TWO QUALITIES, HOWEVER, BUT IS EMPHASIZING THE LATTER. IF UK PERSISTS IN THIS ATTITUDE, ALLIED CONSULTATIONS ON OPTION III WILL BE LENGTHY, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE OTHER ALLIES AGREE WITH THE US ON LIMITING THE NUMBER OF FORUMS.

9. ACTION REQUESTED:

A. MISSION SUGGESTS A US DEMARCHE IN LONDON, AT AN APPROPRIATELY HIGH LEVEL, ON THE NEED FOR CONSULTATIONS WHICH ARE BOTH EXPEDITIOUS

AND FULL, AND ON LIMITING THE NUMBER OF FORUMS, AS THE BEST WAY TO ACHIEVE SUCH CONSULTATIONS.

B. MISSION RECOMMENDS THAT WASHINGTON AUTHORIZE US TO DISCUSS THE QUESTION OF FORUMS, IN ADVANCE OF INTRODUCTION OF OPTION III, WITH THOSE DELEGATIONS MOST LIKELY TO SUPPORT THE US VIEW, I.E., THE DUTCH, BELGIANS AND CANADIANS. THIS WOULD IMPLY BEING ABLE TO GIVE THESE DELEGATIONS THE ADVANCE BRIEFING REFERRED TO IN PARA 6, REF B.  
STREATOR

NOTE BY OC/T: NOT PASSED ABOVE ADDRESSEES.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 01 MAY 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO02430  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 XGDS-1  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750599/abbrzjsp.tel  
**Line Count:** 123  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** A. USNATO 2315 B. STATE 91705  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 03 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <03 APR 2003 by ElyME>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: PROCEEDING IN NATO WITH OPTION III  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE INFO BONN  
LONDON  
MBFR VIENNA  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006